

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/482,235

Applicant(s)

WOOD et al.

Examiner

Brenda Coleman

Art Unit

1624



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brenda Coleman

(3) _____

(2) Mary M. Krinsky

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 9, 2002Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 1-20

Identification of prior art discussed:

journal articlesAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was indicated that the independent claims and all of the claims dependent thereon are denied benefit of their priority based on the definition of R and X.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

BRENDA COLEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1624

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Brenda Coleman

Examiner's signature, if required